REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 – 18 are in the application and subject to a restriction requirement set forth in the December 21, 2006 office action.

Election

Applicant hereby elects claim Group I.

Applicant also elects, with traverse, the species identified in the restriction requirement as A1, claims 1 – 16 being readable thereon.

Applicant also elects, with traverse, the species identified in the restriction requirement as species B1, claims 1 – 12, 15 and 16 being readable thereon.

Traversal

Applicant respectfully traverses the restriction to a single disclosed species.

Applicant submits that, as respects the asserted restriction among species (paragraph 5 of the office action), a proper restriction requirement has not been made in accord with the guidelines of MPEP § 808. Specifically, the restriction requirement fails to provide two requisite aspects: (A) reasons why the species defined in the originally filed claims are either independent or distinct; and (B) reasons why there would be a serious burden on the Examiner if restriction were not required. Moreover, no discussion or reasons are provided in the office action for supporting the conclusion that the species restriction is proper. MPEP § 808.01(a).

In view of the foregoing, applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the restriction requirement between species as set forth in paragraph 5 of the office action.

If the Examiner has any questions, he is invited to contact applicant's attorney at the below-listed telephone number.

Respectfully submitted,
ipsolon llp
/pwh #31,169/
Patrick W. Hughey
Registration No. 31,169
Tel. No. (503) 274-5455